Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CURTISHA HOLDEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

TARGET CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-02217-JST

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE REGARDING DIVERSITY JURISDICTION

Re: ECF No. 1

Defendant Target Corporation is hereby ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why this case should not be remanded for want of subject matter jurisdiction.

Defendant removed this case from Alameda County Superior Court, contending this Court has federal diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Defendant asserts that "[t]he matter in controversy allegedly exceeds the sum on \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest, attorney's fees and costs." ECF No. 1 ¶ 5. Plaintiff's complaint only alleges that the amount of damages exceeds \$25,000. See ECF No. 1-1, Ex. A at 3. Defendant, however, states that Plaintiff made a settlement demand in excess of \$75,000. ECF No. 1 ¶ 10.

As the removing party, Defendant bears the burden of establishing federal jurisdiction by a preponderance of the evidence. Naffe v. Frey, 789 F.3d 1030, 1040 (9th Cir. 2015). In a federal diversity action, a settlement demand may be relevant evidence as to the amount in controversy, but only if it reflects a reasonable estimate of the plaintiff's claim. Cohn v. PetSmart, Inc., 281 F.3d 837, 840 (9th Cir. 2002). The Court cannot conclude based on the Notice of Removal alone that Defendant has carried its burden in establishing the amount in controversy.

No later than Friday, June 17, 2016 at 5:00 p.m., Defendant must file a written response to this Order to Show Cause. The response shall set forth the bases for Defendant's assertion for the amount in controversy, and shall include declarations or affidavits supporting any statements of

Case 3:16-cv-02217-JST Document 11 Filed 06/10/16 Page 2 of 2

	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	5 6 7
	8
	9
	10
Northern District of California	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27

28

United States District Court

1

fact, consistent with Civil Local Rule 7-5. Plaintiff may, but is not required to, file a written
response to the Defendant's response to this Order to Show Cause. Such response shall be due by
Friday, June 24, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. Whether or not Plaintiff files a response, the matter will go
under submission on June 24, 2016 at 5:00 p.m.

If the Defendant does not file a written response, the Court will remand the case to the Alameda County Superior Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 10, 2016

